

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 13-21, and 25-28 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 9 and 21 are amended, claims 10-12 and 22-24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is introduced.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Paul Tsou, during the April 18 personal interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the remarks below.

The Office Action rejects claims 9 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As discussed during the interview, claims 9 and 21 are amended to obviate this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully solicited.

Applicants are appreciative of the Office Action's indication that the arguments made in the November 27, 2006 Response was persuasive. However, the Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. §103, claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25 and 27 over Clark et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,691), Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,494,459) and Olarig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,909); claims 2, 6, 11, 14, 18 and 23 over Clark, Brown, Olarig and further in view of Heberlein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,361,356); claims 3, 7, 15, 19, 26 and 28 over Clark, Brown, Olarig and further in view of Saitoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,274,722); and claims 4, 8, 16 and 20 over Clark, Brown, Olarig, Heberlein and further in view of Saitoh. These rejections are moot with respect to claims 10-12 and 22-24, but are respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

Olarig is a newly applied art and is not directed to high voltage connectors as are Clark and Brown. As discussed during the interview, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Olarig with Clark and Brown because Olarig is non-analogous art with respect to Clark, Brown, and the subject matter of the present application.

As stated by the Federal Circuit, there are two criteria for determining whether prior art is analogous:

1. whether the art is from the same field of endeavor, regardless of the problem addressed, and
2. if the reference is not within the field of the inventor's endeavor, whether the reference still is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor is involved.

*In re Clay*, 966 F.2d 656, 658, 23 USPQ2d 1058, 1060 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

As indicated above, Olarig is not directed to high voltage connectors as are Clark and Brown. Rather, Olarig is directed to computer memory connectors which would have been well known to be powered by 5 volts or less. Thus, Olarig is not from the same field of endeavor as Clark and Brown.

In addition, Olarig is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which Clark and Brown are involved or the subject matter of this application. Clark indicates in the Summary of the Invention that an object is for safe connection and disconnection. Similarly, Brown is concerned about manual touching of the electrically live conductors of the connector. See, e.g., C2/L15-22. In contrast, Olarig is not concerned about safety such as contact by human hands. Rather, Olarig is directed to avoid rebooting the computer due to change of computer configuration when new memory modules are added. See C1/L36-38. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have looked to Olarig to improve or modify Clark or Brown for any relevant reason because Olarig is not relevant to the technical areas addressed by either Clark, Brown or this application.

In view of the above, Olarig is non-analogous art relative to Clark, Brown and this application. Thus, the Office Action has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness

because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Olarig with Clark and Brown.

Further, even assuming, though improperly, that Olarig was being considered, one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to combine Olarig with Clark and Brown because the problems addressed by Olarig are not present in Clark and Brown. As indicated above, Olarig is directed to preventing rebooting of a computer. However, Clark and Brown do not disclose a computer being affected by the high voltage connection and do not contemplate such a device. Thus, Clark and Brown do not need to consider whether a computer must be rebooted when the high voltage connectors connect or disconnect.

Even if the connectors disclosed in Clark and Brown were to have been used in a piece of equipment that included a computer, such a computer would not have required rebooting as high voltages were being connected or disconnected by the connectors disclosed in Clark and Brown. As also discussed above, computer voltages are 5 volts or less and are not high voltages contemplated in Clark and Brown. Thus, such computers would not be affected by connection or disconnection of high voltages which are usually provided for driving motors of electric cars, for example. Continuing with the electric car example, computers mounted on such apparatuses are powered usually by the 12 volt battery which is not a high voltage battery. Thus, even if Olarig was considered, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Olarig with Clark and Brown.

Moreover, even if an attempt was made to combine Olarig, Clark and Brown, the resulting combination would not have satisfied the limitations recited in claims 1, and 13. Claims 1 and 13 require changing a state of the high voltage supply to a disconnected state in response to detachment of said attaching means/unit. Olarig discloses moving a lever 18 from a closed position to an open position, and the computer drives a light-emitting diode 20 from red to green. See C5/L28-37. Olarig discloses the well known DIMM connector that

includes a lever that locks the DIMMs after installation and thus must be unlocked before the DIMMs can be removed. Olarig suggests integrating a signal with lever 18 so that the computer may detect whether lever 18 is in a closed or open position. However, moving a lever from an open to closed position is not detaching the attachment means/unit. Thus, even if an attempt was made to combine Olarig with Clark and Brown, such a combination would not satisfy all the limitations recited in claims 1 and 13.

Lever 18 disclosed in Olarig should not be confused with the cam lever means 44 disclosed in Clark. Lever means 44 disclosed in Clark does in fact move the connectors into connection state and locking the connection or disconnection at the same time via mounting pins 48. If lever 18 disclosed in Olarig is equated to the cam lever means 44, Olarig would be rendered inoperative because lever 18 in Olarig sends a signal to the computer to proceed where the memory stabilization, system configuration and power are controlled to operate in a particular sequence so that rebooting of the computer may be avoided. Cam lever means 44 of Clark would not permit such a sequence to occur because when the cam lever means 44 is moved, the actual connection and disconnection is in operation and would most likely cause rebooting of the computer.

In view of the above, there is no sense in which Olarig can be combined with Clark and Brown, and Olarig is non-analogous to the art involved in Clark and Brown. Thus, not only is Olarig non-analogous art with respect to Clark and Brown, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Olarig with Clark and Brown, and even if forced to be combined, the combination of Olarig, Clark and Brown would not meet all the limitations recited in claims 1 and 13. Accordingly, Olarig, Clark and Brown would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 13.


In view of the above, Olarig, Clark and Brown could not be combined, and even if combined would not have disclosed all the limitations recited in claims 1 and 13. All

remaining claims depend from these independent claims. Thus, Olarig, Clark and Brown would not have rendered obvious the subject matter recited in claims 1-9, 13-21 and 25-28. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-9, 13-21 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-9, 13-21 and 25-28 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Paul Tsou  
Registration No. 37,956

JAO:PT/eks

Date: May 25, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--